

DAVE SKINNER

SENATE LOCAL GOVERNMENT  
EXHIBIT NO. 3  
DATE 2.20.09  
BILL NO. SB423

I support SB 423 for several reasons.

First, this bill is a lot like our lakeshore protection laws, focused only on issues that directly affect water quality. That's how laws should be written.

Second, this bill is modeled on our forestry Best Management Practices. They work great. It is important here to note that protecting streams uphill releases good water down to the mainstem rivers. It is further important to note that massive streamside setbacks suffer from diminishing returns.

Third and most important, this bill allows local governments to mandate larger setbacks, but only upon meeting a critical standard: that of site-specific peer review. I'm sometimes a forestry writer, and I've had to deal with a lot of complete junk science. Advocates will grab a study that suits their political agenda, and try to abuse science by using a study about apples to supposedly "protect" oranges. I'm personally sick to death of biased junk science, arbitrarily applied by ethically challenged people to advance a purely political agenda. That's wrong.

If peer reviewed, site specific, objective science (and I wish the word "objective" was in this bill) shows that the cost of restricting an

activity has clear net benefits, I would support such because worthy, rigorous science – and ONLY rigorous, honest science – is appropriate in the policy arena. This bill may at last make that goal possible. That's why I support it and ask you to do the same.